

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>EDRICE PIERRE, <i>et al.</i>,</b>	:	<b>CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:18-CV-561</b>
	:	
<b>Plaintiff</b>	:	<b>(Chief Judge Conner)</b>
	:	
<b>v.</b>	:	
	:	
<b>INTEGRITY STAFFING SOLUTION,</b>	:	
	:	
<b>Defendant</b>	:	

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 23rd day of July, 2018, upon consideration of the order (Doc. 7) entered by Magistrate Judge Martin C. Carlson on May 14, 2018, wherein Judge Carlson provided notice to *pro se* plaintiffs Edrice Pierre and Edwin Pierre (“the Pierres”) that the Pierres had yet to comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m) regarding timely service of an initial complaint, and wherein Judge Carlson granted the Pierres until June 15, 2018 to effect service or show cause why the matter should not be dismissed for failure to effect proper service, (see Doc. 7), and further upon consideration of the report (Doc. 8) issued June 18, 2018, wherein Judge Carlson recommends that the court dismiss the above-captioned action given the Pierres’ failure to make timely service or to comply with the court’s show cause order, (see id. at 2-4), and it appearing that the Pierres have not objected to the report, see FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(2), and the court observing that failure of a party to timely object to a magistrate judge’s conclusions “may result in forfeiture of *de novo* review at the district court level,” Nara v. Frank, 488 F.3d 187, 194 (3d Cir. 2007) (citing Henderson v. Carlson, 812 F.2d 874, 878-79 (3d Cir. 1987)), but that, as a

matter of good practice, a district court should “afford some level of review to dispositive legal issues raised by the report,” Henderson, 812 F.2d at 878; see also Taylor v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec., 83 F. Supp. 3d 625, 626 (M.D. Pa. 2015) (citing Univac Dental Co. v. Dentsply Int’l, Inc., 702 F. Supp. 2d 465, 469 (M.D. Pa. 2010)), in order to “satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record,” FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b), advisory committee notes, and, following an independent review of the record, the court being in agreement with Judge Carlson that the above-captioned action should be dismissed pursuant to Rule 4(m), and concluding that there is no clear error on the face of the record, it is hereby ORDERED that:

1. The report (Doc. 8) of Magistrate Judge Carlson is ADOPTED.
2. The above-captioned action is DISMISSED for failure to effect timely service as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m).
3. The Clerk of Court is directed to CLOSE this case.

/S/ CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER  
Christopher C. Conner, Chief Judge  
United States District Court  
Middle District of Pennsylvania